

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/774,284	01/29/2001	Samuel Nochumson	260/243	2969
25746	7590 03/29/2005		EXAMINER	
WONG CABELLO LUTSCH RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI, LLP			OWENS JR, HOWARD V	
	SH 249, SUITE 600 TON, TX 77070		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			1623	
			DATE MAILED: 03/29/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	M				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summany	09/774,284	NOCHUMSON ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Howard V. Owens	1623			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 F	ebruary 2005.				
<u> </u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 104 and 109-121 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 104 and 109-121 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.	,			
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 09/774,284

Art Unit: 1623

Detailed Action

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/28/05 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 104 and 109 – 121 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Wan et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,837, 529 in combination with Kasai, J. of Chromatography, Vol. 618,pp. 203-21, 1993 and Bussey et al., U.S. 6,011,148.

Claims 104 and 109-121 have been amended to include the use TMAE chromatography to distinguish the claims over the prior art of record.

Art Unit: 1623

Wan teaches a method for lysing cells using a dual line feed of cell suspension and lysing solution to a primary static mixer; wherein the lysate is fed to a secondary static mixer with a precipitating solution fed separately to the secondary static mixer. Wan anticipates the dependent claims as it further teaches a flow rate of 1 L/min. (col.4, line 18), use of a non acidic unbuffered salt solution in the form of acetate or chloride (col.3, line 50), basic lysis solution (col. 3, lines 19-21), wherein the precipitate comprising contaminants consisting of RNA, chromosomal DNA, lipids and protein, col. 3- col.4).

Wan however does not teach the use of the anion exchange and hydrophobic interaction columns in the purification of plasmid DNA. Kasai bridges the nexus between the prior art and the instant claims as it teaches the use of anion exchange and hydrophobic interaction columns in the separation of nucleic acids. Moreover, the use of tentacle anion exchange chromatography had been used in the prior art for the separation of DNA plasmids as taught by Bussey et al., col. 11, lines 7-23

It would have been <u>prima facie</u> obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use anion exchange chromatography or hydrophobic interaction column chromatography in the purification of plasmid DNA.

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use anion exchange and hydrophobic interaction columns given the established use of these columns in the prior art for the separation and purification of nucleic acids.

Application/Control Number: 09/774,284

Art Unit: 1623

Howard V. Owens Patent Examiner Art Unit 1623

Jámes O. Wilson

Śupervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 1600

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Howard Owens whose telephone number is (571) 272-0658. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. from 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Supervisory Patent

Examiner signing this action, James O. Wilson can be reached on (571) 272 - 0661

Page 4